

1 By letter dated August 1, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel
2 (DOP). In his letter of appeal, Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the
3 Information Technology System Specialist (ITSS) 5 classification.

4
5 On January 12, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review
6 of Appellant's position. By letter dated May 15, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
7 position was properly allocated to the ITSS 4 classification. On May 16, 2000, Appellant appealed
8 the Director's determination to the Personnel Appeals Board. By letter dated June 13, 2000,
9 Appellant identified his specific exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions
10 are the subject of this proceeding.

11
12 Appellant is assigned responsibility for Local Area Network (LAN) and Wide Area Network
13 (WAN) and the desktop technical environment. He provides senior-level, independent, technical
14 assistance to internal and external customers in various business areas on a statewide basis. His
15 duties include in part, coordination, implementation and troubleshooting of the desktop technical
16 environment, hardware and software acquisition, development of agency standards for software,
17 hardware and peripherals, and consulting with staff, management and vendors to plan current and
18 future technology needs. The agency has not designated Appellant's area of responsibility as high
19 risk or mission critical.

20
21 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the CQs for two other employees are
22 identical to his CQ, yet the other two employees were allocated to the ITSS 5 classification while he
23 was allocated to the ITSS 4 classification. Appellant contends that concurrent with the
24 implementation of the class study, duties and responsibilities that he had previously performed were
25 removed from his position in an attempt by the agency to circumvent the reduction in force rules.
26 Appellant further contends that the CQ used to allocated his position was not his official CQ.

1 Appellant asserts that his official CQ reflected duties at the ITSS 5 level and also encompassed his
2 lead duties. Appellant contends that when the class study became effective, he was performing
3 ITSS 5 duties.

4
5 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that prior to the class study, the
6 agency decided to centralize technology functions and to establish a lead position in each building.
7 This realignment of work required that new CQs be drafted. Respondent contends that finalizing
8 the CQ process was not completed until after the implementation of the class study, but that the
9 draft CQs were not changed. Respondent used the draft CQ for Appellant's position as a basis for
10 his allocation. Respondent agrees that Appellant's CQ is substantially the same as two other
11 employees with the exception of lead duties. However, Respondent asserts that Appellant's
12 responsibilities are not mission critical, while the responsibilities of the other two employees are.
13 Respondent argues that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the ITSS 4 classification.

14
15 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
16 allocated to the Information Technology Systems Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

17
18 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Systems Specialist 4, class code 03274, and
19 Information Technology Systems Specialist 5, class code 03275.

20
21 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
22 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
23 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
24 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
25 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
26 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the

1 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
2 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

3
4 While a comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better
5 understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an incumbent,
6 allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an
7 individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or misallocation of a
8 similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a position. Flahaut v.
9 Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

10
11 Appellant failed to provide any evidence to support his assertion that Respondent failed to apply its
12 allocating criteria consistently. In addition, Appellant provided no evidence to support his assertion
13 that the agency was attempting to circumvent the reduction in force rules. Appellant's allocation to
14 the ITSS 4 classification did not result in a reduction in his hours of work or in his salary.

15
16 Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
17 performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current
18 and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
19 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
20 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
21 documented in the CQ. Jacobson v. Dept of Ecology, PAB No. ALLO 99-0004 (2000).

22
23 Appellant provided no evidence to support his assertion that the CQ used by the agency did not
24 accurately describe his duties at the time of the implementation of the class study.

1 At the ITSS 4 level, incumbents are senior professional level specialists responsible for complex
2 systems, projects or operational problems that have a broad impact. Incumbents at this level utilize
3 discretion and independent evaluation to determining how to approach a problem and meet complex
4 systems needs. Incumbents are assigned projects that impact multiple units and functions, integrate
5 new technology and change how business is done. Incumbents at this level serve as a technical
6 mentor and coach to others.

7
8 At the ITSS 5 level, incumbents are professional specialists for major, high risk/high impact
9 systems, projects or operations problems. Incumbents at this level utilize broad, extensive technical
10 and business knowledge to creatively evaluate and meet complex system needs and to resolve
11 problems. Incumbents at this level also serve as a technical mentor, coach and trainer to others.

12
13 Both the ITSS 4 and 5 specifications encompass the responsibility for directing others, i.e. serving
14 as technical mentors and coaches. In addition, the 5 level is responsible for training others and
15 reviewing the work of others. Appellant's CQ does not indicate that he is responsible for training
16 or reviewing the work of others, however, he does provide some lead duties as described by the 4
17 level.

18
19 The ITSS 5 specification encompasses positions that are responsible for major, high risk/high
20 impact systems, projects or operations problems. The agency has not designated Appellant's
21 assignments as mission critical or high-risk.

22
23 When viewed in its totality, Appellant's position does not encompass the level or breadth of duties
24 envisioned by the ITSS 5 classification. The overall duties and level of responsibilities of
25 Appellant's position are best described by the ITSS 4 classification.

1 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
2 determination dated May 15, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

3
4 **ORDER**

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
6 denied and the Director's determination dated May 15, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
7 attached.

8 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

9
10 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

11
12 _____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

13
14 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

15
16 _____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504